

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I thank you very much. On the heels of that request, I also ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak in morning business for up to 20 minutes to give two statements for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARM BILL CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, as farmers in Minnesota and across the Nation enter this year's planting season, I rise today in support of the farm bill conference report Congress will consider later this week.

In the coming days, the Senate and the House, and ultimately the President, will have to make a choice: we will either revolutionize Federal agriculture policies as outlined in this conference report, or we will continue the failed, Washington-knows-best policies of the past 60 years. But that choice should be very clear, Mr. President.

After considerable delay, this much-needed legislation will give our agriculture communities a reasonable and responsible policy roadmap for the future.

In the short term, decisions about planting, equipment purchases, fertilizer and seed sales, and credit will no longer hang in the balance. In the long term, farmers will have less Government interference from Washington, giving them the flexibility to plant for what the marketplace demands—not what traditional Government crop payments have dictated.

I am also proud to note that this legislation is comprehensive and balanced when it comes to protecting our environmentally sensitive lands.

Foremost among these environmental provisions is the Conservation Reserve Program, more commonly known as the CRP. I have heard from many of my Minnesota constituents, including farmers and sportsmen and women, who are pleased to see that the CRP and Wetlands Reserve Program were recognized, maintained, and strengthened because of their high success rates. In Minnesota, these programs will further protect our highly erodible lands while expanding hunting and fishing opportunities.

Mr. President, overall this bill offers tremendous benefits to Minnesota's agriculture community, which already ranks among the Nation's most productive in many of the traditional raw and processed commodities.

For individual Minnesota farmers, this legislation will help meet the

needs of the growing number of value-added cooperatives and their customers who benefit from products such as ethanol. This in turn will help Minnesota's rural communities, which depend on high-output agriculture and value-added products for a large portion of income and jobs.

Farmers and others dedicated to protecting the environment will not be the only individuals helped by this legislation. The American taxpayers will also benefit from the \$2 billion in total budget savings that will go toward balancing the Federal budget.

No longer will this portion of the agricultural budget serve as a potential runaway entitlement, as we saw happen after the 1985 farm bill. Instead, taxpayers and farmers will now know well in advance the specific amount of Federal dollars involved in food production.

But while I enthusiastically support much of this bill because it works on behalf of both Minnesota's farm community and the American taxpayers, I must raise my strong concerns about its potential harm to Minnesota's dairy industry.

For years, dairy producers and processors in the Upper Midwest have struggled against the harmful impact of the archaic Federal milk marketing order scheme. This complex set of regulations has played a key role in the loss of over 10,000 dairy farms in Minnesota over the last decade—an average of nearly three farms every day.

I am pleased to see that this legislation pays some attention to reform of those archaic Federal dairy policies, specifically with the proposed consolidation of milk marketing orders and the elimination of costly budget assessments on producers. However, I must state for the record that continuation of milk marketing orders makes little sense, particularly when most other commodities in the bill are subject to declining Federal payments over a 7-year period.

Continuing the milk marketing orders is disappointing, but the bill's inclusion of the Northeast Dairy Compact provokes even greater concern among the members of Minnesota's dairy industry.

It should trouble my colleagues and their respective dairy industries when Congress authorizes more regulatory burdens and interstate trade barriers.

Unfortunately, that is exactly what happened during conference negotiations on the farm bill with the mysterious resurrection of the Northeast Dairy Compact.

Mr. President, many of my colleagues rightly thought the compact idea to be effectively defeated after we voted 50 to 46 to strike it out of the Senate's farm bill.

However, despite the clear message sent by the Senate, the compact has reappeared in the conference report.

Many of the compact's supporters will say that this is a compromise. After all, the Secretary of Agriculture

will now have to decide whether to allow the New England States to create a compact.

If authorized by the Secretary, the compact would only exist until the implementation of milk marketing orders takes place, which is 3 years from now.

Perhaps they are right. But we are still creating a bad precedent by making it easier for any region to set up its own monopoly. The Senate previously voted against the compact because it would ultimately result in a proliferation of antitrade barriers between the States and regions. At a time when we are trying to open up global markets for our Nation's farmers, it makes no sense to encourage protectionism within our own borders. Yet, that is exactly what the dairy compact would do.

In response to the compact, other regions will work to get similar regional monopolies enacted. For far too long, regional politics have made many farm programs the way they are today—archaic, unfair, unwise, and unworkable.

The purpose of this farm bill is to remove Government interference in the agricultural decisionmaking process and reduce the regional conflicts that have plagued our farm policy for years.

Creation of the Northeast Dairy Compact would accomplish just the opposite—it would expand the role of government across America at the expense of free-trade opportunities.

I will not stand for that and neither should any other Senator who voted against the compact last month. I urge my colleagues to join me in standing up for small dairy farmers across the country by cosponsoring a bill which I am introducing today to repeal the Northeast Dairy Compact.

Instead of compromising on free-market principles and retreating into the past, my bill will move America's dairy industry forward.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that the farm bill before us is obviously not a perfect piece of legislation. It does indeed have weaknesses, but I believe those weaknesses are outweighed by those provisions which move us in a more market-oriented direction.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on behalf of rural America, and on behalf of the taxpayers.

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
AND THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, they are going to be handing out the Oscars tonight in Hollywood, honoring the film industry's best efforts at creating fantasy and make-believe. Well, we create a lot of that in Washington, too, and if it were a movie, the latest Clinton budget would be taking home the award for "Best Special Effects."

After all, it is a document that makes the impossible appear possible. It disguises reality with the smoke and mirrors that are staples of any good special effects team.

It is such a creative effort, in fact, that you have to wonder whether Steven Spielberg and George Lucas somehow had a hand in it.

Yes, the President's budget would be right at home amongst the glitzy phoniness of Tinseltown. And at a cost to the taxpayers of more than \$1.6 billion this year, it is a big-budget production that makes the \$175 million lavished on "Waterworld" look like a drop in a water bucket.

But like any movie, the more often you see it, the more you start noticing the special effects and the more time you spend trying to figure out how they did. And suddenly it is not all so magical anymore.

Unfortunately for President Clinton, the American taxpayers have had almost a week to study his proposed budget for fiscal year 1997, and I think they have begun to figure it out.

After eight earlier tries by the President over the last 13 months, the taxpayers were hoping this budget would reflect the changes they called for in 1994: They want a workable balanced budget, real tax relief for middle-class Americans, an end to welfare as we know it, and the reforms needed to save entitlement programs from bankruptcy.

But after carefully reviewing the President's recommendations, I have to report that this budget does not deliver. In fact, as hard as it is to believe, President Clinton's budget takes the status quo and makes it even worse.

He requests over \$61 billion more in nonentitlement spending than he proposed in his own minibudget last month. He pays for that increased spending by raising taxes and fees by more than \$60 billion. Furthermore, he delays nearly 60 percent of his promised spending reductions until the last 2 years of his plan, making this a paper budget only, with no hope of ever being implemented.

By perpetuating bigger government, more spending, and higher taxes, this document is an affront to the American taxpayers.

One area of this budget I find particularly frustrating is the funding for the Cabinet-level Department of Energy. If we have indeed entered a time in which "the era of Big Government is over," as President Clinton proclaimed in his State of the Union Address, there should be no place in the budget for this \$16 billion relic.

At a time when taxpayers are demanding that Congress be accountable for each and every dollar we spend, Secretary O'Leary and the President have submitted a budget plan that ensures the continuation of DOE's bloated bureaucracy at the expense of responsible, accountable Government.

Perhaps they believe that spending enormous amounts of tax dollars on DOE will mask the fact that the Energy Department no longer has an energy mission of its own. Since the oil crisis that led to its creation in the 1970's evaporated, DOE has expended

its resources in a perpetual attempt to expand its reach and justify its existence. Today, in fact, 85 percent of DOE's annual budget is spent on activities entirely unrelated to national energy policy.

That trend would continue under the President's budget, beginning with the administration's proposal to increase DOE's overhead costs by more than 38 percent next year. At the same time, DOE is boasting of personnel decreases of nearly 20 percent. But if you examine the budget carefully, looking beyond the summary pages delivered to Congress which list nearly 19,000 full-time personnel, the actual decrease is only about 6 percent from this year.

Of course, those 19,000 individuals represent just full-time workers. DOE employs another 150,000 contract employees at its labs and cleanup sites across the country.

If you are looking for a more in-depth breakdown of Energy Department personnel, you will not find it within the pages of the President's budget. The agency does not even rate an individual listing in the historical tables for the executive branch—instead, it's lumped into the "other" category. One can only assume that the White House doesn't want the taxpayers to realize just how large the DOE bureaucracy really is.

There are numerous other examples of how this latest budget symbolizes the wasteful spending that has plagued DOE throughout its search to re-invent itself.

DOE's research, which includes the development of alternative sources of energy such as solar power, has cost the taxpayers more than \$70 billion since the agency's creation in 1977.

But during testimony before Congress last year, Jerry Taylor of the Cato Institute said:

Virtually all economists who have looked at those programs agree that federal energy R&D investments have proven to be a spectacular failure.

The taxpayers have financed a great deal of pork with their \$70 billion investment, but few meaningful scientific breakthroughs. That reckless spending on renewable energy sources is slated to continue. For example, by DOE's own accounts, the fiscal year 1997 request includes an increase of 157 percent in subsidies to the solar building technology industry. Contrary to what this administration would have us believe, however, the solar industry is already competitive, and as a former solar-home builder myself, I can tell you that such an overwhelming increase in a single year is not necessary.

The Department of Energy has proven to be more of a hindrance than a help in making technologies self-sustaining and independent of taxpayer assistance. It is time for the Federal Government to get out of the business of directing market forces in the renewable area.

Rather than spending billions of taxpayer dollars to promote particular in-

dustries within the private sector, DOE should be funding basic research which actually breaks our growing dependence upon foreign oil. Minnesotans recognize that conservation and renewables alone will not heat a home in the winter—it is time this administration owns up to that fact as well.

The President is also requesting \$651 million—a 9-percent increase over 1996—to fund DOE's nondefense environmental management programs. It is all part of the agency's environmental and nuclear waste cleanup efforts. Yet the budget increase comes on the heels of a report issued just last month by the National Research Council which criticized DOE's waste disposal program as being too bureaucratic with too many layers.

Beyond the bloated bureaucracy and questionable spending, the President's budget plan reflects policies which are inconsistent with current law, pending legislation, or at times, even common sense.

For example, the President proposes to delay until 2002 the sale of the Naval Petroleum Reserve oil located at Elk Hills. This is in direct contradiction to legislation enacted last year as part of the President's fiscal year 1996 budget which called for the sale to take place this year. In an effort to continue to milk the NPR for money to pay for additional DOE spending, this administration is rejecting current law, ignoring the fact that there is gross mismanagement at the facility.

And what about the back-loaded savings from the sale of the United States Enrichment Corporation? Under the President's budget, a portion of the proceeds were shifted to 2002. Obviously, he was not watching floor consideration of the most recent omnibus spending bill when this body used those same proceeds to pay for the additional education funding President Clinton demanded. Again, they are trying to spend the same dollars once, twice, three, four, five times.

Then there are the policies which defy common sense. We have all heard about the environmental hazards resulting from leaking oil at the Weeks Island facility. The Energy Department is currently removing over 70 million barrels from there and transferring them to other strategic petroleum reserve facilities—only to be sold in 2002. But again, a portion of the proceeds from the sale have already been spent, targeted to offset the additional spending requested by the President in the omnibus appropriations bill. Again, trying to spend the same dollars more than once, it is smoke and mirrors, trying to balance the budget at the taxpayer's expense.

Furthermore, why does DOE not prioritize the Weeks Island reserve for immediate sale, rather than moving it to another facility, storing it, and then selling it? If the Secretary of Energy believes we will not need this oil in 2002, I am certain we don't need it now.

Mr. President, under this budget, the potential for even further abuses would

continue, because it does nothing to rein in DOE's ever-present search for something to do, someplace to spend the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. There would be nothing to stop the extravagant, taxpayer-funded foreign excursions, or the use of tax dollars to investigate reporters and their stories, or the other wasteful spending that has become all too common at the Energy Department.

The Department would be left to operate mostly as it has in the past—free to pursue its own supposed manifest destiny through expansion, reinvention, and constantly redefining its missions. That kind of freedom has allowed DOE's budget to grow 235 percent since 1977, even in the absence of another energy crisis like the one that led to its creation.

At a time when the people are demanding a balanced budget and justification for every dollar spent by the Federal Government, can any of us in good conscience claim that business as usual at the Department of Energy is how the taxpayers ought to be served?

Mr. President, in presenting its budget to Congress, DOE's chief financial officer testified last week that the document demonstrates a new commitment to streamlining its operations. "More than ever," he said, "American citizens are holding us accountable for superior results with increasingly limited resources. The Department of Energy is meeting these expectations. We are improving our process efficiency and effectiveness."

Mr. President, whether or not DOE is meeting these expectations is a question clearly open to debate. I believe they are falling short, way short. And I am afraid that improving process efficiency and effectiveness will not ensure accountability or solve the fundamental problems that rack the Department of Energy.

President Clinton's budget feeds DOE's problems through more spending. But when will the big spenders here realize that the time-honored Washington tradition of throwing money at a problem does not make the problem go away—that it only perpetuates the status quo and aggravates the damage?

Mr. President, I believe the solution lies in less spending and ultimately, elimination of the Department of Energy. Without a specific and defined mission to guide it, the agency will remain a taxpayers boondoggle for years to come, a burden the taxpayers are no longer willing to bear.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATION IN BURUNDI

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of my colleagues Burundi, a small Central African country. There are 6 million people who live in Burundi. Each week, a civil insurgency tightens its grip on this poor African nation, causing the deaths of hundreds of people. The killing frenzy in Burundi has barely touched international headlines, as it has been dwarfed by the calamities striking Israel and Bosnia. But consider the situation if it were to occur in the United States. The United States has a population of about 260 million. Sliding the scale to the figures of the United States, we would see 30,000 Americans dying a week; 1,560,000 a year. Burundi, my colleagues, is on the brink of national suicide.

The hostilities in Burundi are between the Tutsi-controlled army and Hutu rebels. The current turmoil is the fallout of the explosion of tensions between Tutsi's and Hutu's in 1993. That year, the country's first popularly elected President, a Hutu, was assassinated. In the chaotic aftermath of his death, tens of thousands of Burundians were killed, hundreds of thousands were displaced. Today, Burundi is ruled by a coalition of moderate Hutus and Tutsis who agreed to share power through the mediation of U.N. Secretary General's former special representative, Ambassador Ahmedou Abdallah. The moderates who lead this Government have tried to contain the violence. Their efforts, however, continue to be threatened by extremists on both sides.

A breakdown in Burundi could have catastrophic effects in the country, the region, and in the international community. The world witnessed at great length the tragedy that wrecked Rwanda 2 years ago. Rwanda shares the ethnic makeup of Burundi and is just barely coming to grips with the horror it endured. A collapse in Burundi could crack the fragile peace now established in Rwanda and even worse, could trigger a regional genocide. The international community cannot afford to sit back and watch another egregious slaughter.

The international community, with leadership from the United States, can help. First, we should support last Saturday's meeting of African leaders in Tunis. This meeting was brokered by former President Jimmy Carter. Second, there must be diplomatic efforts to persuade the extremists on both sides that violence is not a credible option. If violence resumes, the United States, in conjunction with its European allies, should be prepared to impose an arms embargo, block international financial transactions by Burundi's extremists and stop all trade with Burundi with the exception of humanitarian relief. And third, we, the Congress, should stand behind the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and private American voluntary and relief projects whose programs promote peace and national reconciliation.

Burundi represents a great opportunity for the world community to exercise preventative diplomacy. The United States should do its share of constructive engagement and assist in heading off a regional genocide before it is too late.

TRIBUTE TO DIANE KASEMAN

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am proud to pay tribute today to a dear friend to me and my wife, Elizabeth Ann, Diane Kaseman. Diane is a longtime employee of the Senate Service Department, where her friendliness, dedication, and charming personality have become familiar to many Members of this body and our staffs. Unfortunately for us, she will be retiring from her position in the Service Department after an incredible 43 years of service to the U.S. Congress.

Diane Kaseman is one of those individuals who takes extreme pride in her work and who truly loves the Senate as an institution. She and her loyal canine pets have become welcome sights to the many hundreds of staff members who routinely seek assistance from the Service Department. She never fails to express genuine concern when one of us, our spouses, or our staff members is under the weather. Her kind words and thoughtful notes never fail to improve our spirits.

Diane is a Rochester, NY native, and began her Capitol Hill career as a receptionist for the late Congressman and Senator Kenneth Keating of New York. She began work on March 27, 1953. Eventually, she moved over to the Senate, where she served on the staff of former Kentucky Senator John Sherman Cooper. Since then, she has served under 11 Senate Sergeants-at-Arms, working with the service and computer facilities.

Not surprisingly, Diane has devoted much of her time over the years to volunteer and community service activities. Early on in her career, she helped establish the Senate Staff Club. Since its founding in 1954, it has sponsored a wide variety of social, civic, and philanthropic projects. She served as the organization's first treasurer. Today, it has over 3,000 members.

One of the Staff Club's major activities has been its blood donor drives, begun in 1978. Diane has been a driving force behind this campaign and has dedicated many hours of hard work and energy to see that the Senate meets its goals. My wife has worked with Diane on many of these blood drives.

In 1981, she received the Sid Yudin Award, which recognized "her dedication to the well-being of her coworkers and for the generous expenditure of her time, talent, and personal resources in the service of the congressional community." These few words are perhaps the best that can be offered to summarize her outstanding career and selfless service.

Diane Kaseman is truly a Senate institution who will be sorely missed